



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/809,423 | 03/16/2001 | Jens Klein | | 4925 |

7590 12/08/2003
Stephen D. I scanlon
Jones Day
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER

SODERQUIST, ARLEN

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1743

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,423

Applicant(s)

KLEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Arlen Soderquist

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1743

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 39, 41, 51, 53-62, 66-68 and 70-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Senkan (US 6,426,226). In the patent Senkan teaches method and apparatus for screening catalyst libraries. Rapid screening for activities and selectivities of catalyst libraries having addressable test sites is achieved by contacting potential catalysts at the test sites with reactant streams forming product plumes at the addressable test sites. The product plumes are screened by translating a sample probe and/or the library to a position that one addressable site is in proximity to the sampling probe sample orifice and passing a portion of the reaction products through the sampling orifice forming a free jet expanded volume in at least one vacuum stage and passing a portion of the cooled and reduced pressure jet stream through an inlet orifice of a mass spectrometer for analysis. The mass spectrometric analysis may be combined with resonance enhanced multiphoton ionization methods of detection for very rapid library evaluation. Suitable reactors, microreactors, and product transfer sample microprobes for product transfer to a mass spectrometer are disclosed in the figures and associated discussion.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1743

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 39-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willson (either WO 97/32208 (Willson '208) or US 6,063,633 Willson '633)) in view of Fawcett. Both Willson '208 and Willson '633 come from the same application and therefore contain the same disclosure. While this explanation of the Willson references will refer to the Willson '633 patent, corresponding disclosure is found in the Willson '208 application. Willson '633 teaches a catalyst testing process and apparatus. In the apparatus and method a multicell holder e.g. a honeycomb (microchannel array) or plate, or a collection of individual support particles, is treated with solutions/suspensions of catalyst ingredients to produce cells, spots or pellets holding each of a variety of combinations of the ingredients, is dried, calcined or treated as necessary to stabilize the ingredients in the cells, spots or pellets, then is contacted with a potentially reactive feed stream or batch e.g., biochemical, gas oil, hydrogen plus oxygen, propylene plus oxygen, CCl_2F_2 and hydrogen, etc. The reaction occurring in each cell can be measured, e.g. by infrared thermography, spectroscopic detection of products or residual reactants, or by sampling, e.g. by multistreaming through low volume tubing, from the vicinity of each combination, followed by analysis e.g. spectral analysis, chromatography etc, or by observing temperature change in the vicinity of the catalyst e.g. by thermographic techniques, to determine the relative efficacy of the catalysts in each combination. Robotic techniques can be employed in producing the cells, spots, pellets, etc. Columns 2-3 summarize some of the aspects of the invention including reaction types, sensors, catalyst taggants and reactions conditions. The reaction types include any reaction which can be enhanced by the presence of a catalyst such as polymerization reactions, halogenation, oxidation, hydrolysis, esterification, reduction and any other conventional reaction which can benefit from a catalyst. Hydrocarbon conversion reactions, as used in petroleum refining are an important use of the invention and include reforming, fluid catalytic cracking, hydrogenation, hydrocracking, hydrotreating, hydrodesulfurizing, alkylation and gasoline sweetening. The sensors used to detect catalytic activity in the candidate catalysts include chromatographs, temperature sensors, and spectrometers. Especially those adapted to measure temperature and/or products near each specific catalyst spot e.g. by multistreaming, multitasking, sampling, fiber optics, or laser

Art Unit: 1743

techniques such as thermography, as by an infrared camera recording the temperature at a number of catalyst sites simultaneously, NMR, NIR, TNIR, electrochemical, fluorescence detectors, Raman, flame ionization, thermal conductivity, mass, viscosity and stimulated electron or X-ray emission. Optionally taggants (labels) can be added to identify particular catalysts, particularly where particles are employed as supports for the catalysts. These taggants can be conventional as discussed in the literature. Taggants can be chemicals which are stable at reaction conditions or can be radioactive with distinctive emissions. The techniques of combinatorial chemistry will be applicable with taggants as well as with catalysts chosen to suit the particular reaction to be enhanced by the catalyst. Temperatures, pressures, space velocities and other reaction conditions can be varied and will be determined by the reactants and reaction. Willson '633 does not give examples of using two analysis methods together.

In the paper Fawcett describes a new instrument. Three powerful analytical techniques, differential scanning calorimetry (DSC), x-ray diffraction (XRD), and mass spectrometry (MS) were combined so that one can completely characterize materials as they are heated in controlled atmospheres. The XRD capability tells, continuously, about the structure of the solid phase in the reaction chamber. The MS monitors the volatiles. And the DSC tells about reaction and phase-change thermochemistry. The set-up was used to study the melting behavior of polymers, the mechanisms of reduction in copper catalysts, and the thermal processing of pharmaceuticals. The combined instrument has several advantages over analyses where the 3 techniques are run separately. The simultaneous analysis allows the analyst to assign specific structural or chemical process data directly to observed thermal events. Because the same environment and sample are used for all 3 analyses, instrumental and sample preparation conditions and errors associated with them are kept constant.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine appropriate analysis methods in the Willson '633 or Willson '203 methods and apparatus as shown by Fawcett because of the clear advantages taught by Fawcett when more than one analysis method is used on the same sample.

4. Applicant's arguments filed September 18, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Relative to the anticipation rejection applicant has not understood that the reference is not claiming benefit of the international application under 35 USC 119. The claim

Art Unit: 1743

for benefit is under 35 USC 365 or 35 USC 120 which is not subject to the guidelines which applicant refers. Applicant is referred to example 7 of MPEP 706.02(f)(1) (Rev.1, Feb. 2003) found on page 700-34 for an example that is analogous to the instant situation. Relative to the obviousness rejection applicant is reminded that Willson is an advance on single reactions run separately and as such would have lead one to use the possibility of multiple detectors use to gain the advantages taught by Fawcett for multiple detectors.

5. Relative to the IDS, the table of contents are not being considered since they do not specifically cite the sections which applicant deems to be relevant to the instant claims. If applicant is interested in having the examiner consider specific sections or the whole book, copies of the appropriate sections should be cited and supplied for consideration.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arlen Soderquist whose current telephone number is (703) 308-3989. After about December 16, 2003, this number will change to (571) 272-1265 as a result of the examiner moving to the new USPTO location. The examiner's schedule is variable between the hours of about 5:30 AM to about 5:00 PM on Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays.

For communication by fax to the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned, (703) 305-7719 may be used for official, unofficial or draft papers. When using this number a call to alert the examiner would be appreciated. Numbers for faxing official papers are 703-872-9310 (before finals), 703-872-9311 (after-final), 703-305-7718, 703-305-5408 and 703-

Art Unit: 1743

305-5433. The above fax numbers will generally allow the papers to be forwarded to the examiner in a timely manner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Arlen Soderquist".

December 1, 2003

ARLEN SODERQUIST
PRIMARY EXAMINER